



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,892	02/21/2002	Jin Lu	US 020046	3938

24737 7590 07/03/2006

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS  
P.O. BOX 3001  
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

JONES, HEATHER RAE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2621

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/081,892	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LU, JIN	
	<b>Examiner</b> Heather R. Jones	<b>Art Unit</b> 2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/20/2002</u> <u>6/18/03</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
  - a. Page 8, line 14: change "105" to -106--.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 16-20 are claiming a video signal, which is non-statutory subject matter.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nagasaka et al. (U.S. Patent Application 2001/0026678).

Regarding claims **1** and **6**, Nagasaka et al. discloses a video system comprising: a storage medium (6) containing at least one video program; a display (1) including a display area; a controller (7) coupled to a storage medium (6) containing a single video program, the controller time-dividing the video program into a plurality of segments and initiating concurrent display of each segment in a different portion of a display area (paragraph [0023]).

Regarding claims **2** and **7**, Nagasaka et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the video program is divided into one of a predetermined number of equal size segments, a number of segments having a predetermined size plus any remainder, and a predetermined number of segments each having an associated predetermined size (paragraph [0023]).

Regarding claims **3** and **8**, Nagasaka et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the display area is divided into one of equal size display portions for each of the segments and a full area display for one segment with overlying insets for each of a remainder of the segments (Fig. 3C).

Regarding claims **4** and **9**, Nagasaka et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that each of the segments are concurrently played within the respective display portion (Fig. 3C).

Regarding claims **11-14**, these are method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims 1-4. Therefore, claims 11-14 are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 1-4.

Regarding claim **16-19**, these are method claims pertaining to a video signal corresponding to the apparatus claims 1-4. Therefore, claims 16-19 are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 1-4.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 5, 10, 15, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagasaka et al. as applied to claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 above, and further in view of Aotake (U.S. Patent 6,411,771).

Regarding claims **5** and **10**, Nagasaka et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1, but fails to disclose that the user controls enable one of playing, stopping, pausing, resuming playing, fast forwarding, fast reversing, and zooming of one or more segments while the segments are concurrently displayed within the display area.

Referring to the Aotake reference, Aotake discloses a display area wherein the user controls enable one of playing, stopping, pausing, resuming

playing, fast forwarding, fast reversing, and zooming of one or more segments while the segments are concurrently displayed within the display area (Fig. 24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of the user controlling enabling of one of playing, stopping, pausing, resuming playing, fast forwarding, fast reversing, and zooming of one or more segments while the segments are concurrently displayed within the display area as taught by Aotake with the video system disclosed by Nagasaka et al. in order to allow the user to still be able to view the other index points in order to quickly change the segment the user is currently viewing.

Regarding claim **15**, this is a method claim corresponding to the apparatus claim 5. Therefore, claim 15 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 5.

Regarding claim **20**, this is a claim pertaining to a video signal corresponding to the apparatus claim 5. Therefore, claim 20 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 5.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather R. Jones whose telephone number is 571-272-7368. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs.: 7:00 am - 4:30 pm, and every other Fri.: 7:00 am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Heather R Jones  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2621

HRJ  
June 26, 2006



THAI TRAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER